

MINUTES

MONTANA SENATE 56th LEGISLATURE - REGULAR SESSION

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

Call to Order: By **CHAIRMAN DARYL TOEWS**, on March 17, 1999 at 3:19 P.M., in Room 402 Capitol.

ROLL CALL

Members Present:

Sen. Daryl Toews, Chairman (R)
Sen. Bill Glaser, Vice Chairman (R)
Sen. Jon Ellingson (D)
Sen. Alvin Ellis (R)
Sen. John Hertel (R)
Sen. Bob Keenan (R)
Sen. Debbie Shea (D)
Sen. Mike Sprague (R)
Sen. Spook Stang (D)
Sen. Mignon Waterman (D)
Sen. Jack Wells (R)

Members Excused: None.

Members Absent: None.

Staff Present: Eddy McClure, Legislative Branch
Janice Soft, Committee Secretary

Please Note: These are summary minutes. Testimony and discussion are paraphrased and condensed.

Committee Business Summary:

Hearing(s) & Date(s) Posted: None
Executive Action: HJR 20 BCI; HJR 21 BCI; HB 125
BCI; HB 301 BCIAA; HB 348
BCIAA; HB 509 BCI; SB 442
TABLED; HB 71 BCIAA.
Discussion: HB 236

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON HJR 20

Motion: SEN. SHEA moved that HJR 20 BE CONCURRED IN.

Discussion:

SEN. BARRY "SPOOK" STANG said history revealed "disaster masters" came in with bills which, in essence, were unfunded mandates for schools. However, **HJR 20** urged the Board of Public Education to work with officials in the schools to identify those things. He said some schools were already doing what was asked in the bill, i.e. designing earthquake or other natural disaster drills. The bill would not hurt anything.

SEN. BILL GLASER said the basic reason for the bill was to get the school and community people to work together for safety.

Vote: Motion carried 6-2 on Roll Call Vote #1, with **SEN. ELLIS AND SEN. TOEWS** voting no. **SEN. SHEA** will carry **HJR 20** on the Senate Floor.

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON HJR 21

Motion/Vote: **SEN. SPRAGUE** moved that **HJR 21 BE CONCURRED IN.**
Motion carried 7-1 with **SEN. ELLIS** voting no. **SEN. SPRAGUE** will carry **HJR 21** on the Senate Floor.

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON HB 125

Motion/Vote: **SEN. GLASER** moved that **HB 125 BE CONCURRED IN.**
Motion carried unanimously 8-0. **SEN. GLASER** will carry **HB 125** on the Senate Floor.

{Tape : 1; Side : A; Approx. Time Counter : 8.1}

DISCUSSION ON HB 236

Motion: **SEN. ELLIS** moved that **HB 236 BE CONCURRED IN.**

Motion: **SEN. ELLIS** moved that **AMENDMENTS HB023601.AEM EXHIBIT**(eds60a01) **BE CONCURRED IN.**

Eddy McClure said the amendments stripped the CI-75 language, explaining when it was in effect, any change in boundaries needed an election. Therefore, the bill was basically in its original form, where both districts had to approve before the transfer of property could take place.

Vote: Motion that AMENDMENTS HB023601.aem BE CONCURRED IN carried unanimously 8-0.

Discussion:

SEN. ALVIN ELLIS asked if his understanding was correct that the property would be divided as it sat and would not follow the students. Rather, the line would stay as drawn when the districts were created. **Eddye McClure** said no 1997 changes had been made, when the transfer laws were amended.

SEN. ELLIS wanted to be sure **HB 236** did not allow gerrymandering of districts. **Eddye McClure** stated current law basically said the trustees of the receiving district would have to approve the transfer. The language in **HB 236** mandated the trustees of both districts to approve the transfer.

SEN. JON ELLINGSON asked for clarification in his understanding that both districts had to agree to the transfer; however, if one district had a problem, it went to the other district to negotiate and come to an agreement. **Ms. McClure** said the bottom line was both districts had to agree.

SEN. BARRY "SPOOK" STANG asked if he was correct in his understanding of current law, if one district wanted the transfer and the other did not, and the County Superintendent denied it, they could go to District Court. **Ms. McClure** said that was done in 1997, and applied to both high school and elementary districts.

{Tape : 1; Side : A; Approx. Time Counter : 13}

SEN. STANG said he would oppose the bill because the law was changed last legislative session, and it had not yet passed the test of time. He said he knew of a district which was having such problems, and the current law worked for them. He had received calls from his constituents who were opposed to the bill.

SEN. ELLIS said he believed **HB 236** was about gerrymandering districts because testimony on the bill revealed the Bozeman district did not allow any out-of-district student to come in, unless the property was transferred. He said testimony also revealed five parcels of property, spotted throughout the Belgrade district, had been transferred to the Bozeman district, so the students could attend Bozeman schools. These students actually resided within the confines of the lines which encircled the Belgrade district. **SEN. ELLIS** opined that was not a good situation because people who lived in a certain geographic area

should vote and participate in a certain school district. If Bozeman wanted to receive those students, it should open its district to out-of-district students.

SEN. STANG asked if current law would mandate they go to District Court in order to get that property into the Bozeman school district. **Eddye McClure** said that process arose when there was opposition to the transfer.

SEN. STANG asked which district took it to District Court, the sending or receiving. **Madalyn Quinlan, Office of Public Instruction**, said 20% of the voters who lived in the territory (not necessarily district) proposed for transfer had to sign a petition.

SEN. DARYL TOEWS suggested there was a way to have the districts reflect where the students were attending, and the County Superintendents could arbitrarily redraw those lines. However, he had not seen any, in the last 20 years, who had the courage to do so. He said large groups of parents should be allowed to attach to something.

SEN. ELLIS proposed the bill go into a subcommittee, for amendments, so it could prevent a single family moving back and forth at will.

SEN. STANG said he was not sure the people affected were on the fringes or in the middle of the circle. People who were on the fringes had a right to move, but if they were in the middle of the circle, there was a problem.

SEN. ELLIS agreed to work on amendments for the bill and report back next week.

Substitute Motion: **SEN. ELLIS** withdrew his motion HB 236 BE CONCURRED IN AS AMENDED.

{Tape : 1; Side : A; Approx. Time Counter : 19.1}

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON HB 301

Motion: **SEN. WATERMAN** moved that AMENDMENTS HB030101.AEM **EXHIBIT**(eds60a02) BE CONCURRED IN.

Eddye McClure explained the amendment basically removed "audiologists" and returned language which had been inadvertently struck.

Vote: Motion carried unanimously 11-0.

Motion: SEN. HERTEL moved that HB 301 BE CONCURRED IN.

Discussion:

SEN. BARRY "SPOOK" STANG appreciated the difficulties rural and small districts were having in getting licensed people; however, it was necessary to maintain a standard in order to obtain licensed people. He found it confusing that Montana Education Association (MEA) would support a bill which would relax the standards of people dealing with children. He said he would probably vote "no" on the bill.

SEN. ALVIN ELLIS said he would support **HB 301** because he did not think the bill would have been before the Committee if the audiologists had changed their rules prior to the time the bill was written. Perhaps their interest was in getting the school back in Montana, but they were exerting force on school districts and were reluctant to change until the bill was written. He said they needed a reason to address this problem, as did the schools. This bill provided for people to complete their education, even though the audiologists maintained that was impossible. He suggested trying the bill for at least a couple of years.

SEN. JOHN HERTEL said his opinion was both the pathologists and audiologists were missing the point of **HB 301**, because it tied the school people's hands. They definitely had to attempt to find this caliber of people to hire. However, there were not enough of these people to go around, so what could the schools do? He stated the testimony referred to the extreme cases, but most schools did not have those cases; therefore, if some of the people were not as highly qualified, those children could be taken care of. That was better than not having anyone at all. He expressed support for the bill.

SEN. DARYL TOEWS said he was concerned about the language which said the district could not hire an unlicensed person if they received an application from a licensed person. He thought it should be clarified to say this person had to meet some sort of criteria, and the district should be able to have some discretion. If a licensed person applied, but was the kind of person who would destroy the school, the bill said the district had to hire him or her. He wondered what language could be inserted which would allow the districts not to hire that person.

{Tape : 1; Side : A; Approx. Time Counter : 30.2}

SEN. JON ELLINGSON asked if **SEN. TOEWS** meant a licensed person applied but in the end was not interested. That would mean the district would have received an application; therefore, could not hire an unlicensed person. **SEN. TOEWS** affirmed. He agreed there should be language which would require they receive an application and the applicant accept the job offer.

SEN. MIGNON WATERMAN suggested if there was an applicant who was offered the job, but he or she refused, there would be an opening. The district would then re-advertise. **SEN. TOEWS** said the applicant would not refuse, but sit on the application, and **SEN. WATERMAN** responded the applicant could not sit on it, if the school board was in charge.

SEN. BILL GLASER said it had to be a valid applicant and **SEN. ELLINGSON** countered with it might be valid, but the applicant might have second thoughts. He explained he didn't think when an applicant applied, it necessarily meant he would take the job if it were offered; rather, it meant he or she was applying, asking to be considered and willing to talk about the details.

SEN. WATERMAN maintained when a position needed to be filled, the vacancy was advertised, the job was offered and if the teacher did not take it, the next person was hired. If the district took applications, and only one licensed person applied but refused the job, there might be unlicensed applicants to whom the district could turn. **SEN. ELLINGSON** said they heard from rural areas, where school boards wanted to hire unlicensed people, so that probably would not happen. The language was vague enough so the school board would not have to hire an unlicensed applicant after it received a licensed applicant.

SEN. ELLIS suggested **SEN. TOEWS'** concern was someone could apply but have no intention of taking the job, which would block the school from being able to put the law into effect.

Eddye McClure conceptualized somebody filling out the application did not automatically mean he or she had the position. The job offer would have to be accepted.

SEN. ELLIS offered "after the licensed person willing to take the position".

SEN. MIKE SPRAGUE said he did not know of any application which was a job offer; rather, an application was a mutual interest to interview for an opportunity to be hired, i.e. a consideration.

SEN. JACK WELLS suggested "resulting in a job offer which would be accepted", or "resulting in hiring".

Eddye McClure proposed "received an application which led to a contract for hiring".

SEN. WATERMAN's interpretation was if the district went through the process of receiving applications from licensed and qualified persons, and none of them took the job, the opening could be filled with an unlicensed person. In other words, the district did not have to perpetually re-advertise.

Eddye McClure thought the intent was to prevent the district being flooded with applications, which would prevent it from offering a job to an unlicensed person. Therefore, "an application which results in the offer and acceptance of employment". **SEN. TOEWS** agreed.

The conceptual amendment: "has not received an application that results in an offer and acceptance of employment from the licensed person".

Motion/Vote: **SEN. JACK WELLS** moved the conceptual amendment **BE CONCURRED IN. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 11-0.**

SEN. WATERMAN wondered if there was room for districts to advertise for licensed persons, receive applications but reject all of them in order to hire unlicensed people, which were cheaper.

Eddye McClure's opinion was in order to be offered a job, the applicant had to meet the qualifications.

SEN. JON ELLINGSON asked if a licensed person was automatically qualified for any of these jobs. **SEN. WELLS** said the school board could have a legitimate reason, having nothing to do with qualifications, for not hiring someone.

{Tape : 1; Side : B; Approx. Time Counter : 0}

SEN. WELLS wondered if current law forced a school board to hire, or if it had legitimate reasons to not do so, would it be a risk for the board.

SEN. JOHN HERTEL said some licensed people would not fit in certain school systems and he did not think school boards should be tied to that.

SEN. WATERMAN contended the situation now was if they did not hire, they went without. However, the bill as amended would allow them not to hire the person they did not like, but hire the unlicensed person.

SEN. HERTEL commented that was possible if there was not another licensed person available.

SEN. ELLINGSON said he could not imagine the licensed applicant not having a bonafide qualification which would give the school board the right not to hire the person.

SEN. WELLS said if they really felt that way about the applicant, the board could still go without and seek another applicant, knowing if, immediately upon denying him or her, they hired an unlicensed person, the board would be liable.

Motion/Vote: **SEN. HERTEL** moved that HB 301 BE CONCURRED IN AS AMENDED. Motion carried 8-3 on Roll Call Vote #2, with **SEN. STANG**, **SEN. WATERMAN** AND **SEN. SHEA** voting no. **SEN. HERTEL** will carry HB 301 on the Senate Floor.

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON HB 348

Motion/Vote: **SEN. WATERMAN** moved that AMENDMENTS HB034801.AEM **EXHIBIT**(eds60a03) BE CONCURRED IN. Motion carried unanimously 11-0.

Motion/Vote: **SEN. WELLS** moved that HB 348 BE CONCURRED IN AS AMENDED. Motion carried unanimously 11-0. **SEN. WELLS** will carry HB 348 on the Senate Floor.

{Tape : 1; Side : B; Approx. Time Counter : 6.2}

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON HB 509

There was discussion on an amendment, which was declared unnecessary, and therefore, disregarded.

Motion/Vote: **SEN. ELLIS** moved that HB 509 BE CONCURRED IN. Motion carried 10-1 with **SEN. TOEWS** voting no. **SEN. FRED THOMAS** will carry HB 509 on the Senate Floor.

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON SB 442

SEN. DARLY TOEWS explained it was necessary to table SB 442 because of the CI-75 language.

Motion/Vote: **SEN. STANG** moved that SB 442 BE TABLED. Motion carried unanimously 11-0.

{Tape : 1; Side : B; Approx. Time Counter : 14.2}

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON SB 460, HB 71, HB 103

Discussion:

Kathy Fabiano, Office of Public Instruction (OPI), said **HB 71** dealt with all districts, including the current 29 districts, which found themselves over maximum and, therefore, required to come down at the rate of 4% per year. The bill which dealt with those 29 districts which were over-maximum was **SB 460**. She then explained **EXHIBIT (eds60a04)**, which was self-explanatory. She said the way equalized districts were currently treated (Column 3) was the most punitive, which was because when the basic entitlement was included in the per-ANB budget, a small high school district's per-ANB budget tended to be higher. Under **HB 71**, districts would be required to come down at the rate of 4% per year, regardless what happened to their enrollment. The problem with **SEN. ELLIS'** options was the K-12 districts because their ANB was considered in total; yet, the ANB entitlements differed for an elementary district, a high school district or an accredited seventh and eighth grade program. There were two different rates, but one ANB count, which could result in a district's ANB remaining the same, even though the high school could be increasing and elementary decreasing.

{Tape : 1; Side : B; Approx. Time Counter : 21.2}

SEN. ELLIS commented, even with an over-max budget, if their ANB remained the same, his amendment would allow them to face a budget which was no different from their present one. **Kathy Fabiano** agreed that was true, but it would need to be clarified because the maximum budget would move.

SEN. ELLIS asked if his amendment worked to change the budget, i.e. the ANB stayed the same but if they gained elementary and lost high school, they would have lesser; if elementary lost and high school gained, they would have more. **Kathy Fabiano** affirmed, but cautioned only if that was his intent, because at that point, they were still frozen. What would he do if the elementary decreased by seven and the high school increased by three, which would result in a net reduction of four ANB? Would the budget be reduced at 4 times the high school rate or 4 times the elementary rate?

SEN. TOEWS asked to which other options #4 could tie. **Ms. Fabiano** said option #4 dealt with all districts which found

themselves over the maximum because of declining enrollments. They would be required to come down at least 4%, according to **HB 71**. The other three options only dealt with those 29 districts which were currently over maximum. Any of options #1, #2 or #3 could fit with #4, as long as it was clear those 29 districts would be treated differently from those which were currently equalized, or between the base and maximum.

Motion/Vote: **SEN. WATERMAN** moved to **APPROVE REMOVAL OF CI-75 LANGUAGE FROM ANY BILL CONSIDERED TODAY. Motion carried unanimously, 11-0.**

Eddye McClure explained AMENDMENTS HB007103.aem **EXHIBIT (eds60a05)**, saying REP. ROSE'S intention was everyone should come down 4%, but #4 changed the 96% to 94%.

SEN. TOEWS said the reason for that was there could be an increase of 6% before the new numbers for a budget increase were valid. He thought it appropriate if 6% was the figure for an increase, it should also work for declining enrollments.

SEN. ELLIS commented if there was a 10% reduction, the district had to absorb at least 6%. If there was a 32% reduction, it would have to be taken in the five years. **SEN. TOEWS** affirmed, further explaining districts would have five years to get their budgets down, and it would be done in 6% increments.

Eddye McClure explained AMENDMENTS HB007105.aem **EXHIBIT (eds60a06)**, and explained when HB 667 was instituted, districts at the bottom had five years to get to the top. **SEN. ELLIS** wanted percentages changes in Amendment #7, iii, as follows: (A)20%; (B)40%; (C)60%; (D)80%. **SEN. ELLIS** said the way he visualized this working was the next year when the budget was developed, a new set of figures was being worked with because the enrollment was lower. The reduction of 20% had to be addressed, or a minimum of 6%.

{Tape : 1; Side : B; Approx. Time Counter : 33.1}

SEN. STANG asked for further explanation and **SEN. TOEWS** said schools with severely declining enrollments were affected. **SEN. WATERMAN** said **SEN. TOEWS'** amendments told how much the decline was, which would trigger allowing the district to keep the previous year's budget. **SEN. TOEWS'** response was even if there was a 10% declining enrollment, the district would take 6%.

Eddye McClure said in **SEN. ELLIS'** it would go down 6%, but Amendment #4 dealt with school districts which declined 30% or

more. **SEN. ELLIS** continued the explanation by saying if the district's enrollment dropped by more than 30% in the current budget year, it had to accept 20% of that drop. If the decline was exactly 30%, it would still be 6%; however, if it was 32%, for instance, it would be a bit over 6%.

SEN. BILL GLASER commented **SEN. ELLIS'** amendments were assuming this would happen only once, in 1999. He suggested, instead of actual dates, using "first year, second year, etc." **SEN. ELLIS** agreed, explaining **Ms. McClure** built the amendments off the way schools were forced into the window. She used fixed years, but that was not his concept because the process may not be initiated right away, i.e. the decline might not be experienced until the year 2000, which would make the initiating date later.

SEN. WATERMAN asked how **SEN. ELLIS'** amendment would help a school whose enrollment dropped 40% this year, rose 30% the next year and declined 20% the following year. Once the district triggered into the five years, would the district then continue in that window, or only if it declined each year. **SEN. ELLIS** said that district, with a 40% decrease, would have to take 20%, or 8% the first year. The next year, with the 30% increase, they would be within 2% of maximum so they would have to take the 2%, because the target changed due to the population increase. If they were not at maximum, they could vote to increase their budget.

Madalyn Quinlan, Office of Public Instruction (OPI), addressed the amendment which talked about how a district closed the gap over time. She said the percentages were similar to the language used when districts had five years to come up to the base budget, 1993-1998, and she thought they were accurate. **SEN. ELLIS** reminded her the actual dates had to be deleted, because there was no fixed schedule. "Year 1, Year 2, Year 3, etc." was what he had in mind.

SEN. TOEWS asked for more explanation when a district declined, then increased, then declined, etc. **SEN. BOB KEENAN** offered **SEN. ELLIS'** explanation was correct, in that down 8%, then up 6% meant the district was staying just underneath that 2%.

SEN. GLASER suggested if the actual dates were deleted, the amendment was dynamic enough to work with the system.

Ms. McClure said if there was not a drop of 30% or more, there would be a return to 6% or the greater of amendments. **SEN. ELLIS** agreed it stayed in place as long as that substantial decrease was there; however, if not, they would be relieved of it because they could fall under the provisions of 6%.

{Tape : 2; Side : A; Approx. Time Counter : 0}

Kathy Fabiano said the same thing happened when schools which were below the base were coming up. The base amount moved because the enrollment was growing, but in closing the gap, they were looking at whatever the difference was. She said it worked.

SEN. WATERMAN said she understood the amount of the General Fund budget would fluctuate with the enrollment; however, she still read the amendment as saying once the action was triggered (if enrollment declined by 30%, for example), the five-year percentage reduction had begun. **SEN. ELLIS** admitted (iiii) needed to be added to Amendment #7 to address that concern. **SEN. WATERMAN** asked if there would be a 1% increase and no necessity to meet those requirements, or would the base budget just differ. **SEN. ELLIS** suggested (iiii) address the situation of a further increase in a succeeding year, which would result in a student population which was less than 30% below the current year's student population.

SEN. STANG asked why it could not be 6% per year, with a crash the last year, because they had five years to get it done.

Kathy Fabiano said if a district dropped 32% and triggered the five-year plan, but had an enrollment increase at the end of the third year, they would still close 50% of the difference. They would continue to close in on the maximum, but the amount they would have to come down would be less because the difference was less when the enrollment began to climb.

SEN. WATERMAN said she wanted to clearly understand once the five-year plan was triggered, the district was in it, even though the money amounts could change. **SEN. ELLIS** agreed the district should get to its ANB level in five years.

Kathy Fabiano asked for clarity that once a district hit the 30% decline, it would be tagged to have five years to close the gap. If, however, the district had less than a 30% decline, it would come down no more than 6% per year.

SEN. ELLIS said his amendments included those of **SEN. TOEWS** because both declining enrollment and exception clause were included. **SEN. TOEWS** said his amendment to change the percentages was in **SEN. ELLIS'** amendment.

SEN. WATERMAN wondered why the percentage changed from 6% to 4%. **SEN. TOEWS** said a budget authority adjustment was possible if there was over 6% growth in a given year. **SEN. ELLIS** said another way to consider it was if there was a 5% increase in

student population, the district was stuck with the previous year's ANB. However, if there was a 6% increase or more, the district could have a subsequent budget which addressed that increased student population.

SEN. WATERMAN remarked it was difficult for large districts to deal with a 6% enrollment decline because the loss was so large. She thought the 6% was better for small districts. **SEN. ELLIS** affirmed her remarks, but suggested it might be easier for a larger district to address the changes because there was more flexibility in class sizes and numbers, etc.

SEN. TOEWS suggested the Committee vote on the amendments, explaining his amendments moved the percentage to 4% and did not put the five-year tag on the district. **SEN. ELLIS'** amendments added a formula; otherwise, they were very similar. **SEN. WATERMAN** asked, and was affirmed, if they stayed with **HB 71**, the percentage would be 4% per year, no matter how many years it took.

{Tape : 2; Side : a; Approx. Time Counter : 9.3}

Motion/Vote: **SEN. ELLIS** moved that **AMENDMENTS HB007103.AEM BE CONCURRED IN**. Motion carried 7-4 on Roll Call Vote #3, with **SEN. STANG, SEN. WATERMAN, SEN. ELLINGSON AND SEN. SHEA** voting no.

Motion/Vote: **SEN. ELLIS** moved that **AMENDMENTS HB007105.AEM BE CONCURRED IN**. Motion carried 6-5 on Roll Call Vote #4, with **SEN. STANG, SEN. ELLINGSON, SEN. SHEA, SEN. SPRAGUE AND SEN. TOEWS** voting no.

{Tape : 2; Side : A; Approx. Time Counter : 13.1}

Madalyn Quinlan, OPI, explained Amendments HB007107.aem **EXHIBIT (eds60a07)** addressed an issue raised by both **HB 103** and **HB 71**. Currently, when districts which were between the base and the maximum (equalized window), began voting from either the prior year's budget or the prior year's budget per student times the new student count. If the district had declining enrollment, and either could not get a levy passed or did not put a levy to the voters, it had to reduce its budget. The amendment said the voting point should begin from the prior year's budget because it was more understandable to the public. She said the effect on schools was if there was declining enrollment, voting began at a slightly higher level; however, if the enrollment was increasing, voting would begin at the prior year's budget.

SEN. TOEWS reiterated this amendment dealt with voting only, not the rest of the budget, and **HB 103** was the proper bill from which to have the discussion.

Motion/Vote: **SEN. STANG** moved that **AMENDMENTS HB007107.AEM** BE **CONCURRED IN**. Motion carried unanimously 10-0.

Motion/Vote: **SEN. ELLIS** moved that **HB 71** BE **CONCURRED IN AS AMENDED**. Motion carried unanimously 11-0. **SEN. ELLIS** will carry **HB 71** on the Senate Floor.

{Tape : 2; Side : A; Approx. Time Counter : 19.5}

Discussion on HB 584

Madalyn Quinlan, OPI, gave her comments from **EXHIBIT (eds60a08)**.

SEN. WATERMAN asked for verification of her understanding if schools wanted the equipment, they would write in and have their name on the list. If their name was at the top, they would get the computers, i.e. Helena could not say they wanted the first 5,000 computers as they became available. **Ms. Quinlan** affirmed.

ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment: 5:15 P.M.

SEN. DARYL TOEWS, Chairman

JANICE SOFT, Secretary

DT/JS

EXHIBIT (eds60aad)